

**REMARKS****I. General**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, and 12 have been amended and claims 2, 4, 8, and 19 have been canceled by the present amendment. The outstanding issues in the current Office Action are as follows:

- The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of terms that can be implied.
- Claims 4 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.
- Claims 1-3 and 5-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. JP 10-064685 (hereinafter, *Ikeuchi*).
- Claims 12-16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeuchi*.
- Claims 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeuchi* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,137,483 (hereinafter *Ochi*).

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**II. Amendments**

The specification has been amended to delete “[d]isclosed are” in the first sentence of the Abstract. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claims 2 and 4. Accordingly claim 1 now presents original claim 4 in independent form. No new matter is presented.

Claim 3 has been amended to correctly depend from claim 1, since it originally depended from claim 2, which has been canceled and incorporated into claim 1. No new matter is presented.

Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 8, and a part of the limitations of claim 7, providing proper antecedent basis for claim 8. No new matter is presented.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 19, and to provide a proper antecedent basis for “closely spaced plurality of turns.” Accordingly, claim 12 now presents original claim 19 in independent form. No new matter is presented.

### **III. Objections to the Specification**

The Abstract has been amended to delete “Disclosed are” objected to by the Examiner as a term that can be implied. The amendment redresses the concerns expressed by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that specification is allowable.

### **IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

On page 2 of the Office Action claims 1-3 and 5-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ikeuchi*. Applicant traverses the rejection and asserts the claims are allowable, at least, for the reasons stated below.

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the applied reference must teach each and every element of the claimed invention. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Claim 1, as amended, presents original claim 4 in independent form. Claim 4 has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form to include all of

the limitations of its base claim and intervening claim, see page 6 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 1.

Claim 6, as amended, recites “wherein a portion of the heater wire coupling said first set of more than one turn and said second set of more than one turn **does not provide heat output.**” (Emphasis added). The Examiner asserts, on page 3 of the Office Action when addressing claim 8, that *Ikeuchi* teaches this limitation. However, *Ikeuchi* recites that “a heat generation quantity is positionally adjusted so that a center of this cold cathode fluorescent lamp forms a substantially uniform temperature distribution free of higher temperature than both end parts.” Abstract. Thus, *Ikeuchi* teaches freedom from the higher heat of both ends that have a densely distributed winding pitch, implying a lower heat provided by the less dense winding pitch in the center. The foregoing fails to anticipate not providing any heat output in a portion of heater wire coupling said first set of more than one turn and said second set of more than one turn. Therefore, *Ikeuchi* fails to teach or suggest this limitation of amended claim 6 as required for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 6.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9-11 depend either directly or indirectly from, and inherit all of the limitations of their respective independent claims 1 or 6. Therefore, claims 3, 5, 7, 9-11 are allowable, at least, because they depend from independent claims 1 or 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claims 3, 5, 7, 9-11.

## **V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

### **A. Rejections over *Ikeuchi***

On page 4 of the Office Action claims 12-16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeuchi*. Applicant traverses the rejection and asserts the claims are allowable, at least, for the reasons stated below.

Claim 12, as amended, presents original claim 19 in independent form. Claim 19 has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form to include all of

the limitations of its base claim. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of record.

Claims 13-16, 18 and 20 depend either directly or indirectly from, and inherit all of the limitations of independent claim 12. Independent claim 12, as amended, has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant asserts claims 13-16, 18 and 20 are allowable, at least, in their dependence from claim 12. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of record.

**B. Rejections over *Ikeuchi* in view of *Ochi***

On page 5 of the Office Action claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeuchi* in view of *Ochi*. Applicant traverses the rejection and asserts the claim is allowable, at least, for the reasons stated below.

Claim 17 depends from, and inherits all the limitations of, independent claim 12. Independent claim 12, as amended, has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of record.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 200300327-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail Airbill No. EV482708995US, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: July 29, 2005

Typed Name: Elise Perkins

Signature: Elise Perkins

Respectfully submitted,

By R. Ross Viguet  
R. Ross Viguet  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No.: 42,203

Date: July 29, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8185